

Approved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
AmeriTel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

**ICTL Members (ICTL):**

Conley, Paula  
Criner, Elizabeth (not present)  
Howard, Supt. Marilyn  
Joslin, Ann  
Leaf, Bill  
Manning, Darrell  
Marley, Rep. Bert  
Newby, Vern  
Ruch, Charles, represented by  
O'Neil, David  
Richardson, Senator Melvin,  
ICTL Chair  
Stivers, Gary, represented by  
Szofran, Nancy  
Tilman, Rep. Fred  
Vauk, Karen

**Higher Education Information  
Technology Committee  
(HEITC):**

Bow, Randy (not present)  
Brady, Christine (not present)  
Burton, DeVere (not present)  
Johnson, Gens (not present)  
Kiesz, Kelly  
Lay, Terry (not present)  
Martin, Kathy (not present)  
Pittman, Monti  
Rahm, Carmen  
Szofran, Nancy  
Wilde, Glenn (not present)

**Idaho Educational Technology  
Association (IETA):**

England, Bob  
Reynolds, Vikki

**Public Education**

**Information**

**Technology**

**Committee (PEITC):**

Black, Pete  
Chandler, Vickie  
Conley, Paula  
Ganske, Karen  
Gibson, Chris  
Leaf, Bill  
Mauer, Karen (not present)  
McGrath, Deb  
Mikelson, Ray

**Bureau of Technology  
Services (BOTS):**

Hawkins, Dan  
Krun, Lynda  
Kuskie, Mark  
Merritt, Sherawn  
Mincer, Rich  
Wilson, Dawn  
Zalucha, Tracie

**Technical Assistants:**

Beck, Jerry (not present)  
Campbell, ken (not  
present)

**Deans:**

Gentry, Dale (not present)  
Hill, Janette (not present)  
Garrett, Joyce Lynn (not  
present)

**Guests:**

Anchorage, Gene  
Anderson, Karen  
Breithaupt, David  
Dalashmet, Devon  
Elwood, Rich  
Hart, Jeff UOI  
Hasselquist, Keith  
Horton, Jeff  
Jeffery, Bill  
Lanz, Dave  
Marconi, Jim  
Peck, Duane  
Philphry, Jill  
Shamburg, Steve  
Shinn, Jeff  
Rush, Wayne  
Thornsberry, Dale

**Regional Technology  
Advisors (RTA):**

Johnson, Gwen S.  
Kennedy, Eddie not  
present  
Rogers, Heidi  
Sammons, Dorothy  
Thorsen, Carolyn

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

The meeting began 9:10 am with introductions of the newly appointed Representative Martinez, Senator Bert Marley, and Karen Vauk, Executive Director of Micron Foundation. The Idaho Council for Technology in Learning (ICTL) members introduced themselves and gave a brief personal background. Nancy Szofran represented Gary Stivers and Dave O'Neill represented Charles Ruch, BSU. Changes to September 25, 2001 minutes: Gwen Johnson represents Lewis Clark State College (LCSC).

**Motion #1:** Vern Newby moved to accept the September 25, 2001 meeting minutes, including corrections, as written. Bill Leaf seconded the motion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

**Budget Discussions:** Dr. Howard gave a brief breakdown of budget cuts, which included the Technology Grant from \$10.4 to \$8.4 million. Schools will be very cautious and thoughtful on their budgets and approach to spending for the coming year. The Department's main priority is services to children in classrooms.

Keith Hasselquist: Base reduction for Professional Technical programs and community colleges averaged 9-10%. Higher Education had a 3% reduction, while most other agencies had a 4% cut. Colleges and Universities requested a 12% fee increase, which was approved by the State Board of Education and will offset one half of the base reduction. Funds for teacher training and matching Gates Grant were not funded for 2003.

Rich Mincer: Reviewed the legislative intent language with the ICTL council. A breakdown of the \$8.4 technology grant was reviewed. A new document on Charter Schools funding was reviewed and discussed.

Jeff Shinn, Department of Financial Management: The Governor has ordered all state agencies to stop spending money and initiated a hiring freeze. April, the number one month for tax revenue, was down \$61 million. The state is trying to conserve cash, and there may be a possible holdback for the next fiscal year.

**Higher Education Information Technology Committee (HEITC)** - Ann Joslin: The HEITC Mission and Vision, and Strategic Plan was reviewed and discussed. During the fiscal 2002, HEITC met five times and had several guest speakers. The majority of the committee meetings were spent developing HEITC's strategic plan, which will be reviewed on an annual basis. HEITC's number one goal is expanded access, which includes distance education. The institutions and agencies have collaborated their efforts in education.

Nancy Szofran discussed, the Idaho Electronic Campus (IEC), technology incentive grants, and extensive outcomes of online courses. A complete documentation and graphics of IEC statistics will be mailed to the ICTL. The on-line courses provided, taken, and completed were discussed. The national average completion rate in Math is 40%; Idaho's completion rate is 75%. There has been tremendous growth in on-line participation from 486 to 2094, illustrating the IEC's success. This success is due in part to the wide range of on-line

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

services offered to students. The ICTL council would like to receive data on the different types of delivery systems and how they compare to others, including assessment; as well as, the institutions and agencies doing to secure outside grants or funding.

**Motion #2:** Ann Joslin requested that ICTL council accept and present the HEITC Mission and Vision Strategic Plan to the State Board of Education. A vote was taken and there was unanimous consent.

**Bill and Melinda Gates Grant of \$750,000.00** – Vikki Reynolds and Dale Thornsberry: The Bill and Melinda Gates grant is a three-year project providing administrative leadership and technology skills/training for district and school administrators. The curriculum was created in response to the expressed needs and interests of practicing administrators, but has been modified and adapted to better meet the needs of the participants in their daily tasks as administrators.

Current enrollment for the 2001-2002 school year – 45 superintendents, 9 assistant superintendents, 49 other office staff, 209 principals, and 45 assistant principals totaling, 357. Thirteen trainers provided 14 training sessions across Idaho's 6 regions. Training included two days in September and January and one in April for a total of five days – 40 hours of instruction = 2 college credits, which is optional.

The project has been evaluated on an ongoing basis by the trainers and the trainees. Project satisfaction is as follows: review of curriculum = 94%, presentation of excel 91%, presentation and use of internet 92%, improve use of technology 78%, improvement in leadership skills 68%, use of data 59%, trainers ability 98%, and applicability of program 84%.

Enrollment for next year will be 15 Superintendents, 71 principals, 39 others totaling 125. Project contacts are: [iasa@idschadm.org](mailto:iasa@idschadm.org) or [dalethor@spro.net](mailto:dalethor@spro.net) - Dale Thornsberry, Project Coordinator; or Vikki Reynolds, IASA; and Mike Friend, IASA. 208-345-1171.

**J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation** – Wayne Rush: The J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation has funded three areas, Opportunity 1- Hardware and Software of just over \$27 million, Opportunity 3– Professional Technical Academies, and training. The grants started in 1998 and funds began in 1999.

An extensive two-year study on technology's impact on student learning demonstrates a significant improvement. Albertson's foundation believes funding technology should be tied to training. "We want to improve student learning, increase the achievement and success in students, transform teaching practices, and improve the integration of technology in new teacher education."

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

Through the Milken Foundation study *How Teaching Matters*, students whose teachers conduct hands-on learning activities out perform peers by more than 70% of a grade level in math and 40% of a grade level in science.

ISIMS – Idaho Student Information Management Systems – We want to support the state in good data management through the ISIMS project. The Albertson’s Foundation is also working closely with the Colleges and Universities to improve education.

The ICTL council suggested a letter of appreciation be written to the J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation and offer condolences for the loss of Kathryn Albertson.

**ISIMS – Idaho Student Information Management System** – Sherawn Merritt: NCS Pearson contract was signed in January for a \$3.5 million grant from Albertson’s for the specific integration of software standardization. There will be special pricing offered to any school district in the state. ISIMS is a two year pilot project with 13 participating districts: Boise, Coeur d’Alene, Fruitland, Homedale, Idaho Falls, Jerome, Lapwai, McCall Donnelly, Mountain Home, Middleton, Meridian, Nampa, and Pocatello.

In February, NCS Pearson met with the participating districts giving an overview of their products and implementation process over the next two years. The initial installation of the products began in March and will continue through June. Certification training is provided in April and May to certify districts to use SASIxp. Five individuals from each school building will be trained from June through August, who will then train other personnel.

The ISIMSsoftware models will be:

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| SASIxp         | Student account system and daily on line attendance, district integration – individual schools information transfer to district office on a nightly basis;                     |
| IGPro          | Grade book for teachers’ utilization;  |
| Parent Connect | Web access allowing parents to see grades, attendance, daily classroom projects; have e-mail capabilities, a special education module, extended test history; and SQL drivers. |

The benefits are to share software configurations where appropriate, increasing district standardization. This will allow data to be collected and reported in an efficient manner to the State Department of Education with shared resource capabilities.

This project is initially funded by the Albertson’s Foundation for the first two years, with the districts picking up the maintenance costs beyond that time. The software costs are listed below:

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
 Ameritel Inn, Boise  
 May 9, 2002

**New NCS Pearson customers:**

| <b>Product</b>  | <b>Cost</b>          |
|---|----------------------|
| <b>SASIXp which includes:</b>   | <b>\$ 10/student</b> |
| 1. <b>Elementary Schools</b> (Base Apps and Classroomxp)<br>2. <b>Middle/Jr-Sr/Secondary Schools</b> (Base Apps, Grading, Period Attendance, Schedule Pro, and Classroomxp)<br>3. <b>District Office</b> (District Integration and Reporting) |                      |
| <b>SASIXp Special Ed module</b>   | \$1/student          |
| <b>ParentCONNECT xp</b>   | \$1/student          |
| <b>InteGrade Pro</b>  | \$3/student          |
| <b>SQL upgrade for District Integration and Reporting</b>   | \$.65/student        |
| <b>SASIXp Extended Test History module</b>  | \$1.10/student       |

**Legacy NCS Pearson customers:**

| <b>Product</b>  | <b>Cost</b>           |
|---|-----------------------|
| <b>SASIXp which includes:</b>   | <b>\$7.25/student</b> |
| 1. <b>Elementary Schools</b> (Base Apps and Classroomxp)<br>2. <b>Middle/Jr-Sr/Secondary Schools</b> (Base Apps, Grading, Period Attendance, Schedule Pro, and Classroomxp)<br>3. <b>District Office</b> (District Integration and Reporting) |                       |
| <b>SASIXp Special Ed module</b>   | \$1/student           |
| <b>ParentCONNECTxp</b>  | \$1/student           |
| <b>InteGrade Pro</b>  | \$3/student           |
| <b>SQL upgrade for District Integration and Reporting</b>   | \$.65/student         |
| <b>SASIXp Extended Test History module</b>  | \$1.10 student        |

**Federal Programs – Goals 2000, Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF), E-Rate, and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Grants** – A current update on the federal programs was presented by Dawn Wilson. The completed Goals 2000 Federal Report was distributed to members.

E-Rate – 2001-2002 schools and libraries received \$4,475,358.43 in grant funds. Idaho so far has received \$383,336.96 for 2002-2003.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Grant - No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was signed by President Bush in January 2002. The goal is to improve student academic achievement using technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade, encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

professional development and curriculum, and promote researched based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

The Ed Tech Grant funds available to Idaho are \$3,000,078.00. We must sub-grant fifty percent of the funds by formula to the districts based on their LEA's (local education agencies) proportionate share of funds under Title I. Funds will flow to the districts after July 1, 2002. Funds from Title I will have to be justified for expenditures. The other fifty percent must be distributed on a competitive basis with priority given to the districts that received an insufficient amount of Ed Tech formula funds.

At least 25% of these funds must be used to provide on-going sustained and intensive high quality professional development. Some of the different activities schools districts can do are partnerships, emphasis on accessibility for high need schools, technology training, achievement for technology literacy, effective courses and curriculum, developing courses, promote and foster collaboration with parents and community members.

An application packet for both the formula and the competitive funds will be mailed during July. The districts will have until September 2004 to spend the funds. There currently are no state technology standards. It was suggested a subcommittee be formed to look at creating state technology student standards.

Recommendation from the K12 Subcommittee:

**Motion #3:** Motion made by Bill Leaf - FY 2003 ICTL Professional Development Requirements for K12 School Districts: The required equivalent of 25% of the ICTL Grant monies received by the districts be spent on teacher training, using any funding sources. Each district will decide on how to spend these teacher-training funds using vendors, universities, or internal sources. Motion died for lack of a second.

**Motion #4:** Representative Fred Tilman motioned to repeal a portion of motion #3s of the April 12, 2001 ICTL minutes:

Approved ICTL Meeting Minutes April 12, 2001 – Motion #3s: It was moved by ICTL member Greg Fitch and seconded by ICTL member Elizabeth Criner on April 12, 2001 to eliminate the required 4-7% for evaluation and assessment from the ICTL technology funding, and to allow districts to produce evaluation/assessment reports as per Phase 2 requirements. ICTL staff are directed to prepare a standardized rubric for the format for data collection and reporting, to be available for the 2002-2003 reporting. Vote was taken, passed unanimously.

Representative Tilman's motion requests the elimination of the Phase 2 requirement that 20-30% be spent on professional development. Vern Newby seconded the motion. Vote was taken. There was one opposing vote, Paula Conley. Motion passed effective May 9, 2002.

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

**Motion #5:** Represented Tillman motioned, and seconded by General Manning, an ICTL Student Standards Subcommittee be formed. This subcommittee's sole purpose will be to establish benchmarks and indicators for a "technology literate 8<sup>th</sup> grade student," based upon the ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education) standards and already developed district technology standards. The standards set will be sent to the State Board of Education for approval and implementation/incorporation into the State Standards. The subcommittee chairperson will appoint the subcommittee membership. The subcommittee will present a full report to the ICTL. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Robin Stanley, Mullan District Superintendent– Requests and concerns:

1. The application, development of plans, and evaluation process of the Phase 1/2 be simplified and streamlined.
2. There is a need for clarification on the data to be collected.
3. There are concerns regarding the past Phase 2 target dates; he suggested they not be changed once sent to districts.
4. Local option for evaluation and data collection be considered. Is concerned data asked to be collected be different than what has already been collected the past few years?
5. Flexibility with new standards that allow the old data to be carried forward and put towards the new standards.
6. Less money required to be spent on professional development.

**State Reports:** Dawn Wilson - Phase 2: A contract has been made with Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC) to develop an on-line Phase 2 survey instrument based upon the past reporting rubrics. ICTL data for state legislative reports and SDE data for federal reporting requirements under ESEA will fulfill district requirements for state funding.

The Northwest Educational Technology Consortium is working on a streamline system of reporting. The United States Department of Education (USDE) is interested in what we are doing in the West and are looking at providing some funding for all the systems working together for a consolidated data collection system.

Attached are statements by Jim Marconi and Vikki Reynolds.

Dates for the statewide tour were passed out. If there are changes made to the draft Phase 2 disseminated today, it will be presented to the ICTL for a final review, as suggested by the ICTL Chair.

Dawn Wilson demonstrated the preliminary on-line State Technology Plan. The State Technology Plan, when completed, will be aligned with the following foals: State Board of Education, Federal, State Department of Education, and the original eight ICTL goals. This

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

plan will be seamlessly merged with the K20 or K-Life and the higher education plan. The access to students' with disabilities portion of the ESEA Act will also be addressed in the new plan. This plan will be online and updated regularly. Districts will be able to input their state technology plans, if they so choose, into the same format under a technology builder section.

Next ICTL meeting will be within the next 60 to 90 days. The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.



Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

**The following are verbatim statements, as requested, by Jim Marconi and Vikki Reynolds.**

Jim Marconi – Boise School District: “I agree with Bill Beverage, we are headed in the right direction with this report. My concern, however, is the report has begun to look more like a school accountability report instead of a student program report. I think from my perspective, the Council for Technology in Learning in the State of Idaho has outgrown its usefulness. I say that because I sat in and listened to these comments for the entire time we have had this council. Every year or at least twice a year, we have very positive comments, such as Wayne Rush and the good numbers he shows on the screen.

We are constantly seeing the positive effect of technology on education and everyone is always very good about that. No one has ever said you spent this money and it is bad, you should not have done this. We continue to hear, and this year is worse than ever in terms of having 28% less money this year than we have ever had, we have less than subsistence amount of money to keep technology going in the school systems around the state, that includes maintenance, support, replacement of new technology and doing all the new things coming in like the levels testing, so forth. The state is providing less assistance than opportunities to do the work we need to do.

We are doing some good things in terms of IETA – the coordinators group around the state, ISIMS – coordinating and consolidating data, so we have some parallel functions being managed in terms of data and cross checking accountability and all those kinds of things. I guess what I am trying to say, and I apologize for the speech, but what I would like to have the council consider is technology start to look as less of a distinct separate neat item and include it as part of the instructional program that the Department of Education administers. Discontinue thinking about it in terms of, well we have to have a report, it is going to take fifteen minutes or one hundred and fifty hours, it doesn’t matter, it is part of the overall program.

I had a little bit of an epiphany the other day, I realize that in the good ole days 1994, 95 I was thought of as a well sought after person, because we were buying computers, having training, doing software with the schools, neat stuff. Somewhere along the line, along with the last two or three years, it changed from being really good stuff to be absolutely, positively essential we have turned into a utility. If someone walks into a room and a light does not work, it is the same kind of deal when the networks are not up or the computers are not operating. So, again, we need to stop thinking about this as being something that is marginalized or outside of the scheme of these we do in education and start thinking about it as part of the infrastructure of education and I think we are going in the right direction. This is a school improvement, school accountability kind of a report, just need to turn the corner with this kind of focus. Thank you.”

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

Vikki Reynolds – IETA – Curriculum change: “One of the reasons we changed some of the curriculum over time was because we started this whole process of developing curriculum and talking to people in March. By the time we got down to September, we had gone into the Standards Implementation and there needed to be a much heavier emphasis in data analysis, data driven-decision-making, and a little less on leadership. You will notice that many people have had leadership training. This is a little bit more advanced and had some things toward their current need. Their immediate need was more emphasis on the data analysis, which was also included but maybe not as heavily as they needed. Based on the changes within the fast track to try to get the standards implemented, they needed to have this information. That is one of the reasons we adjusted the curriculum.

**Question, Vern Newby:** What happens with administrators that come in from out of the state, and is there a gap in the funding from grants or Gates Foundation to where we are going to be on down the line?

*Vikki Reynolds* – Initially with the Universities, was that hopefully we could develop and possibly through the association sustain some on-going professional development. Until we knew which direction and what the University programs were going to look like, like Deb said, her program already contains quite a bit of that. Therefore, we may not need to impact the preparation programs as much as those coming. Is that something the higher education needs to do? Is that something we need to do? Does it need to be a combination, that is the piece we need to sit down with Higher education and try to figure out this summer, and try to refine the curriculum? Maybe there is pieces of it that the Universities are going to take, and pieces that are going to be appropriate through professional development at the association level.

Funding – there again, that is where the sustainability of this is going to come from, weather it is through the University adding what we have learned and what we have identified as needs for training for administrators in the preparation programs. That would rather be a natural hopefully, a natural part of the programs that are already in place. Already it is beginning to impact the professional development planning from an association perspective. Also, there are hopefully going to be, through the variety of activities going on throughout the state, some emphasis on professional development, teachers, administrators, everybody, and we would hope, of course, that this would be a piece of that as well.

**Question -Representative Fred Tillman** - Have you been working with the *Idaho Most* to decertify, look at the whole certification process for administrators and including this in that process?

*Vikki Reynolds* – I have to tell you that I do sit with the Most committee under their professional development category. The certification does have administrators in it; however, we have been told repeatedly, in no uncertain terms, that Most is dealing with teachers. Once the teachers are taken care of, then hopefully the administrators will follow along. Let me tell you that what happen with the standards is that when they established

Unapproved Minutes  
**IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)**  
Ameritel Inn, Boise  
May 9, 2002

teacher standards, the IASA had a small subcommittee of people working, kind of parallel with the Most committee. When we got down to that part of it, the administrator standards were presented to Most by that kind of adhoc subcommittee. The Most committee accepted them, with a few corrections or adjustments, and they were accepted. What Most is anticipating with administrator's in the professional development arena, frankly one of the things I have been told makes sense to me, is that the certification for administrators isn't basically a teacher's certification, therefore the certification requirements are going to impact administrators as well as the teachers, what ever they come up with, the three tiers and the whole bit. I do not know exactly what they are going to come up with, but they kind have told me to keep my shirt on, frankly, until they get some of this worked out. In the professional development arena, they are strictly focusing on teachers.

**Question:** *Carolyn Thorsen* - Do you have the flexibility within this grant in the remaining two years, targeting the curriculum at Idaho's Assessment Accountability programs, so the administrators will be able to analyze the data?

*Vikki Reynolds* - Frankly Carolyn, that is exactly what we did. It would blow your mind, and I would have to show you some time. We have already had that flexibility. What we did for their end project on the final day, was that we had an excel spreadsheet that had been developed as a sample with ITBS, district stuff, samples of just everything. Literally, intentionally overwhelmed the participants, and said, ok, this is the data you are going to get, what are you going to do with it? Anything that comes out of that plan would be slotted into those excel things. The reason we chose excel is that it is the lowest common denominator. You can use NWEA reports, use many things, but you need various types of information how are you going to put it all together."